

# Review of: "Urban Green Infrastructure Planning for the Bangkok Metropolitan Region: An Empirical Study for Greenspace Expansion"

Andrew Butt<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overall the paper is well written and well constructed. There is clear evidence of good editing of the manuscript.

The topic is interesting and certainly timely in so many cities where the capacity for enhancing urban greening remains a technical and political challenge, but one very necessary to manage urban heat urban livability and simply quality of life.

There's a few direct points I would make regarding the draft manuscript:

1. the introduction reads very well, however I would consider some subheadings to more clearly layout the intent and structure of the work. For example Page 3 contains some statements which are normatively true, but seem to lack a direction for what is intended - in that example paragraph three tells us that green infrastructure is important for sustainable cities, for this paper essential issue seems to be the forms of strategic interventions that do this most effectively. in some respects then the introduction is not sufficiently ambitious in directing this of the rich and these two features about is found through it.
2. The discussion of the study area is useful, however it's not clear whether the study area is Bangkok city or the entire metropolitan area - the text seems to change in this regard and the first map could provide some clarity about the details of the metropolitan region and the specifics of the analysis. This would be very helpful I think it would also be useful to describe some existing relationships between various urban land uses – residential, commercial, recent development and green spaces - beyond the mention of a few parks that is currently made.
3. I consider that Section 3 may need some restructuring. At present the work commences immediately the set of existing databases. Logically the overall mapping of method which is contained as a diagram towards the end of this section should be presented to the reader earlier. Likewise a table demonstrating not only what data is included but the reason would be helpful early on perhaps before the series of maps of each data set which I should note and difficult to rate in some instances and so maybe as useful in tabular form. In this regard the logic of inclusion and scoring does need to be clearer there is a couple of examples of ideas for scoring which aren't clear to me - is proximity to roads important and for what reason is being closer better or worse likewise proximity to existing green space is provided with the score but it is not clear if being close reduces the overall spread of spaces in the region or in fact contributes to clusters and networks of open space both might seem to be valuable approaches to decision making and scoring - other examples exist too in this regard.

4. The discussion in Section 4 is generally well written but some clarity is needed to consider what this actually means and what limitations may be presented by the model in this regard. A most apparent example is the preference for existing public land - in some ways this seems a fairly unambitious finding and suggests that perhaps land valuation presents too much of a barrier to strategic greening - whereas presumably in time all public land should be managed for green infrastructure anyway. Some commentary on this would be helpful. The detailed discussion of sub districts a game would benefit from the earlier presentation of the case study area within the metropolitan region.
5. In the conclusion both methodological and policy implications presented perhaps it could be clearer how they are separate and I consider that the authors should put more emphasis on the on the policy possibilities. This section also introduces the concept of a Greenbelt, yet the overall work appears to be presenting a model for the distribution of greening across the urban area - whether this is an editing issue or the introduction of a new concept should be interrogated and carefully considered earlier on in the work all this reference should be removed.
6. Some more detailed issues do arise in the work. For example I was unclear how land values were assessed - with these THB per hectare? The category scoring for distances were similarly unclear and were perhaps drawn from other literature or as convenient breakpoints, either way some explanation would help. I'm unsure of the journal style but this is written in American English and that should be checked to ensure it is consistent with expectations.